

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to an Office Action mailed January 2, 2008. Prior to this response, claims 1, 4-6, 8-9, 11, 14-17, and 19-22 were pending. After amending claims 1, 4, 6, 9, 11, 14, 17, and 20, claims 1, 4-6, 8-9, 11, 14-17, and 19-22 remain pending.

In Section 3 of the Office Action claims 1, 4, 11, and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Gauthier (US 2002/0122205). The Office Action states that Gauthier discloses classifying print content in a document by matching print content to vocabulary terms in the library, and so identify variable data in a document, which is printed using a predetermined bitmap in memory.

Gauthier discloses a process that identifies variable data in a document. Once variable data has been identified, it is linked to a bitmap already stored in memory [0011-0012]. This repeated use of the predetermined bitmaps permits a higher speed printing process (Abstract). The first step in this process is to identify whether data is static data or variable data. In PostScript, print content (the data that appears in a printed document) is identified with print job commands that enclose the data within parenthesis [0029]. Once data is identified, it is compared to a list of data strings to determine if the data is variable [0030].

In the interests of passing the claimed invention to issue and to clearly distinguish the claimed invention from Gauthier, claims 1 and 11 have been amended to remove the feature of “executing a program to

initiate additional document processing” from the recited library of executable programs. With the above-mentioned phrase removed from the base claims, the Applicant respectfully submits that Gauthier fails to disclose every limitation of claims 1 and 11, and cannot anticipate those claims. Claim 4, dependent from claim 1, and claim 14, dependent from claim 11, enjoy the same distinction over the cited prior art.

In Section 5 of the Office Action claims 8-9 and 19-20 have been rejected as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with Gauthier in view of Hull (US 5,978,477). The Office Action acknowledges that Gauthier fails to disclose the use of OCR or the generation of text strings. The Office Action states that Hull discloses these limitations and that it would have been obvious to modify Gauthier in view of Hull to facilitate full text searching. This rejection is traversed as follows.

Even if Hull’s capabilities are combined with Gauthier, the combination still fails to explicitly describe the establishment of a library that sends reports of the document to a recipient, blocks the document print process, logs the document print process, updates a database, archives the document, or executes a plurality of programs to initiate additional document processing. Further, the motivation of performing full text searching does not suggest modifications to Gauthier that would make these claim limitations obvious, based on either the Hull reference, or what was well known at the time. Since the combination of references neither explicitly discloses all the claim limitations, nor suggests modification to Gauthier that would make all the limitations obvious, the Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 8-9 and 19-20 be withdrawn.


Section 6 of the Office Action states that claims 5-6 and 15-17 would be found allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the subject matter of the bas and intervening claims.

Section 7 of the Office Action states that claims 21 and 22 are allowed. Note: the Applicant neither expressly agrees nor disagrees with the stated reasons for allowance.

It is believed that the application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: 3/11/2008

Respectfully submitted,



Gerald Maliszewski
Registration No. 38,054

Customer Number 55,286
P.O. Box 270829
San Diego, CA 92198-2829
Telephone: (858) 451-9950
Facsimile: (858) 451-9869
gerry@ipatentit.net